

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 25 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1, 24-29, 35, 36, 39-42, 44-51, 57, 58, 61-65, 70-71, 73, and 85-87 are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 24-27, 35, 36, 39-42, 44-47, 50, 51, 57, 58, 61-65, 70-73, and 85-87 are allowed. Claims 28, 29, 48, and 49 are rejected as indefinite. Applicants have cancelled claim 48 amended claims 28, 29, and 49. Upon entry of the Amendments, all of the pending claims except claim 48 remain pending. Support for the Amendments is found in the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request entry of the Amendments.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 28, 29, 48, and 49 are rejected under § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action points out various deficiencies in the claim as regards claim language, antecedent basis, and the like. Applicants would like to thank Examiner Brittain for his careful review of the claim language and for giving them an opportunity to amend the claims before issue.

Applicants have amended claims 28 and 29 for clarity. Applicants believe the claims are definite. Claim 24 (from which the rejected claims depend) recites a first and a second fastening element, both of which include "extending nanotubes". Claim 28 further defines the invention by claiming an embodiment where at least some of the extending nanotubes of the first element and/or at least some of the extending nanotubes of the second element are "functionalized to a non-linear shape". The chosen claim 28 language conveys that embodiment, but in fewer words. No further claim amendments are needed to convey the definite meaning of claim 28. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 28 to better clarify that some of the extending nanotubes of claim 24 are functionalized. While claim 24 states the

elements include extending nanotubes, claim 28 adds that some of the elements include nanotubes that are functionalized. Applicants respectfully submit claim 28 is definite.

Claim 29 is amended to clarify even further that the non-linear shape to which at least some of the extending nanotubes (*see* claim 28) have been functionalized includes hooks, loops, and spirals. Applicants respectfully claims 28 and 29 as amended are definite and request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 48 has been cancelled and claim 49 amended slightly to depend from claim 44. Claim 49 adds the limitation that the nanotubes can be loops; it is properly dependent from claim 44. Applicants believe cancellation of claim 48 has addressed the indefiniteness issue raised by the Examiner.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicants believe that the pending claims are now in a state of allowability and respectfully request an early Notice of Allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned Applicants' representative if that would be helpful to resolving any issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 25, 2006

By: Mark A. Frentrop
Monte L. Falcoff
Reg. No. 37,617
Mark A. Frentrop
Reg. No. 41,026
Attorneys for Applicant

HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MLF/MAF/cg